[illegible]

By

[illegible]

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of
the University of Florida
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Florida
[illegible]

[illegible] Bondell,

[illegible] friend

Acknowledgments

I would like to [illegible] David [illegible] for his [illegible] of research interest [illegible] Also [illegible] thanks go to [illegible] interest and sensitivity to my [illegible] support and independence.

Thanks are due to Dr. [illegible] indispensable statistical advice [illegible] I would also like to thank the [illegible] Dr. Franz [illegible], Dr. Sidney [illegible] and Dr. Gerald Avila, for their [illegible] valuable aid in completing this [illegible]

Finally, special thanks are due to my [illegible], Marlene, for [illegible] interest, support and [illegible] Robert Ellett for his assistance as a [illegible], to Jim Hollan for programming assistance, to [illegible] for [illegible] consultation.

[illegible], but definitely not least, I [illegible] thank the majority of Florida students who [illegible] willing to share themselves and their time with me in order to make this research possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

[illegible] TABLES

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Chairman: Dr. Harry [illegible], Jr.
Co-Chairman: Dr. David [illegible]
Major Department: Psychology

The use of "[illegible]" [illegible] terms [illegible] personality factors, sex, [illegible] leadership [illegible] are data [illegible] and 28 [illegible] subjects.

[illegible] of [illegible] personality [illegible] questionnaire [illegible] and low [illegible] distance [illegible].

[illegible] that [illegible] linearly [illegible] individual's use of interpersonal distance; [illegible] high JSDQ [illegible] at [illegible] than subjects [illegible] interpersonal distance [illegible] experimental [illegible] do not differ significantly [illegible] do not [illegible] significantly [illegible] variables, although they do [illegible] when

[illegible] setting, informations [illegible] high [illegible] lt in greater [illegible] stances [illegible] interaction of the [illegible]

Results from [illegible] different subjects are considered and discussed. [illegible] are advanced and questions [illegible]

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

[illegible] may be a relevant [illegible] of [illegible] may be [illegible] are [illegible] that there are [illegible] extension of [illegible] intuitively [illegible] to [illegible] have [illegible] [illegible] there may be [illegible] one of [illegible] part of [illegible] world.

[illegible] largely

[illegible] depending on the [illegible] and emotional [illegible] as using [illegible]

[illegible]ature

[illegible] focus of [illegible] human [illegible] over is not [illegible] among [illegible]ce is a [illegible] element [illegible] preferred [illegible] over-[illegible] decision [illegible] the [illegible] individuals [illegible]noun, [illegible]stian et al., [illegible]

[illegible]thin [illegible]ext of [illegible], [illegible] impersonal [illegible] of the [illegible] scientist [illegible] is of a [illegible] resulting [illegible] of systematic work [illegible]ed research [illegible] this paucity of [illegible] to the additional [illegible] by having a few

[illegible]

[illegible]) and [illegible] were placed [illegible] e of [illegible] combine [illegible] interpersonal [illegible] hip [illegible] ring in a [illegible] [illegible] an [illegible] in [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] ions an [illegible] jects [illegible] sat [illegible] each other. [illegible] face-to-face until the [illegible] five-and one-half [illegible] a side-by-si [illegible] ency to sit closer together in [illegible] one.

Willis (1966) fo [illegible] sex differences in the use of [illegible]. He measured the initial speak [illegible] jects and found that both men and [illegible] closer to women (21 58 inches) than to [illegible] Women

[illegible] the most [illegible] of [illegible] in the natural environment.

Hall (1966) [illegible] a number of [illegible] to and others [illegible] to recognize [illegible] cent [illegible] seems [illegible] used [illegible] of [illegible].

[illegible] onal [illegible] and [illegible] subjects [illegible] field independent [illegible] to be signi[illegible] distance, although [illegible] could very well have [illegible] Also [illegible] found that [illegible] had trends, but [illegible] to inter-personal distance.

[illegible] et al (1965), [illegible] found that physical [illegible] tended to increase the interpersonal distance between the stigmatized [illegible] interactants. Kuethe

[illegible] Lord. [illegible] that a [illegible] would [illegible] distance [illegible] also [illegible] regression [illegible] background [illegible] indicated that [illegible] in having [illegible] in values [illegible] placed [illegible] than [illegible] that relationship.

[illegible] have been only a few [illegible] have [illegible] personal factors [illegible] of distance [illegible] (1964 [illegible]) [illegible] in [illegible] them to [illegible] with an unknown confederate. [illegible] stood 2-1/2 to 3-3/4 inches farther away from the confederate than did the non-stressed subjects. Both [illegible] subjects in an anxiety producing situation and [illegible] judge the interpersonal distance between themselves and an unknown confederate. Anxious subjects judged the distance as significantly closer than either the [illegible] distance or distance judged by non-anxious subjects.

Goethe and Weingartner (1964) found that non-homosexual penitentiary inmates tended to place male and female figures closer together than did homosexual inmates. Homosexual inmates placed male figures closer together than male and female figures. These findings suggest that

[illegible] l use [illegible] be [illegible] may [illegible] [illegible] enter a [illegible] approval they [illegible] [illegible]) was signifi-cantly [illegible] demonstrate disappro[illegible]

Sommer ([illegible]) [illegible] personal space by schizophrenic [illegible] sing a seat at a table, schiz[illegible] opposite or [illegible] distant chair [illegible] schizophrenic's typical choice of [illegible] female [illegible] with a female [illegible], they tended to [illegible] than they did to [illegible] also closer [illegible] would sit with either sex. Sommer's conclu[illegible] schizophrenics have an impaired concept of [illegible] in social interaction. Horowitz et al (1964) [illegible] the use of "body-buffer zones" or cocoons of [illegible] man insulates himself from others. He [illegible] schizophrenics have a significantly larger zone than [illegible] schizophrenics. This and other observations lead [illegible] to consider the use of space in therapy, with the resulting conclusion that the use of physical interpersonal distance may be closely related to the use of emotional distance in interpersonal relations (Horowitz, 1965).

[illegible] factors, [illegible] ural [illegible] as [illegible] little doubt [illegible] interpersonal [illegible] communication may [illegible] several [illegible], few [illegible] ship [illegible] personal [illegible]

[illegible] inter- [illegible] within [illegible] that it [illegible] interpersonal [illegible] dis- [illegible] of the [illegible] an [illegible] "self" of [illegible] dominant [illegible] personal [illegible] tance. [illegible] it may be [illegible] consistent, [illegible] relationship [illegible] personality of an [illegible] as measured by [illegible] and his [illegible] use of interpersonal [illegible]. It is also

[illegible] accuracy, [illegible] are [illegible] the [illegible] personality [illegible] and [illegible] ing t[illegible] of [illegible] differences.

[illegible] ies

[illegible] personality [illegible] Questionnaire (16PF). [illegible] succe[illegible] personality questionnaire items. [illegible] ing tests provides a measurement of a wide range of [illegible]-order personality factors [illegible] dominance, [illegible]thymia and dependency [illegible] also gives [illegible] of several second-order factors such as neurotic[illegible] and anxiet[illegible] which provide additional personality information. The test-retest reliability is variable (.7[illegible].5) with stable personality factors having a high reliability and relatively unstable factors having a lower reliability.

Construct validity for the [illegible] factors of the 16PF ranges from 0.73 to [illegible] using the original

[illegible] equati[illegible]ious vocation[illegible] ([illegible]ell, 1962)

[illegible] The test [illegible]rallel forms. [illegible] short period o[illegible]eously to provi[illegible]er number of [illegible].

[illegible] the 16PF ([illegible]) a variety of [illegible]sons ([illegible] factor analyzed [illegible]-Zimmerman [illegible]onality Question[illegible] and o[illegible] the same factor space. It is [illegible] one to the other by a [illegible] et al (1970) describes the typical [illegible]iduals with high loadings on [illegible]ple, high factor A individuals [illegible] positive comments, high [illegible] and high Q1's are rated as [illegible] the group. Cattell and Stice ([illegible]) a profile for individuals [illegible] on sociometric ratings. [illegible] personality to creativity

[illegible] con-
[illegible] Jourard [illegible] extensively [illegible] this factor and its [illegible] The Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) was developed as an instrument for measuring at least one facet of this dimension of personality (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958). Studies have been done which relate self-disclosure to the healthy personality (Jourard, 1964), low neuroticism (Mayo, 1968) and positive self-concept (Jourard, 1967, Shapiro, 1968). Also it has been shown that disclosure may be dependent upon the "dyadic effect" (Chaze, 1968) in which the disclosure of one individual in a dyad has an influence on the disclosure of the other person (Jourard and Resnick, 1970).

Split-half reliability of the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) has been found to be high .94 by Jourard and Lasakow (1958) and .98 by Dutton (1963). Studies of predictive validity have had rather mixed results. Himelstein and Lubin (1965) found no significant relationship between JSDQ scores and nominations by peers for the person "most likely to confide." Murley and Hurley (1968) found no significant relationship between JSDQ scores and ratings of disclosure by group members.

[illegible]

Hypot[illegible]

[illegible] there is a [illegible] personality f[illegible] and the use of [illegible] In addition it is hypot[illegible] relationship be[illegible] the person [illegible] and the use of interpersonal [illegible] tions. Finally, [illegible] are between sex, age, [illegible] relationship, [illegible] divorce.

[illegible]

1. [illegible] are significantly [illegible] personal [illegible] dysthymia or [illegible], critical, [illegible] assertive, [illegible], dependent, [illegible] mania / [illegible] likes [illegible] responsive, [illegible] withdrawn,

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] self-sufficiency / group dependency.

Subjects with high JSDQ scores will [illegible] a greater distance than subjects with low JSDQ scores.

The [illegible] use of interpersonal distance in the experimental setting will not differ significantly from their use of interpersonal distance in a comparable naturalistic setting.

Females will use closer distances under all conditions than males.

Interactions which are rated by subjects as being of significant intimacy in naturalistic settings with friends will result in closer distances than will interactions of minimal intimacy in naturalistic settings with friends.

Interactions of significant intimacy in both naturalistic and experimental settings with individuals rated as strangers will result in greater interpersonal distances than interactions of minimal intimacy.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Subjects

The subjects used in [illegible] male and [illegible] female students in [illegible] classes at the University of Florida [illegible] in the research was in part [illegible] class requirements.

Materials

The Cattell [illegible] (1970) was used to obtain a measurement of [illegible] factors for each subject (Cattell, 1962, [illegible], 1470). This scale, based on factor analytic [illegible] provides a measurement of a wide range of [illegible]. Of the forms of the test available, [illegible] and 3 were both given to each subject. This provides greater stability since each factor has [illegible] twice as many items as usual. This procedure is recommended by Cattell (1962)

The Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958) was administered in an attempt to provide information regarding each subject's use of self-disclosure (see Appendix A).

[illegible] Questionnaire. The [illegible] sex, [illegible], [illegible] (see Appendix B).

The [illegible] were [illegible] questions. [illegible] of these questions had a low [illegible] value, while the [illegible] had a high [illegible] (see Appendix C). These questions were adapted from the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire.

An interaction notebook was devised and distributed to each subject. This notebook consisted of a series of [illegible] upon which the subject [illegible] each daily interaction in which he took part. These [illegible] a number of [illegible] factors such as age and sex, which could influence the behavior in the interaction (see Appendix D). A [illegible] of these dimensions were pre-set. Thus a subject was required to have had in one week at least ten interactions with strangers, ten with friends and so on (see Appendix E).

Finally an event-recorder was used to get a quantitative [illegible] of the [illegible] during the Self-Disclosure Interview. This score, although not directly involved with the focus of this research, is noteworthy because of its possible bearing on the research outcome. Argyle and Dean (1965) and others have found that there may be a possible reciprocal relationship between eye-contact and

[illegible] necessary by [illegible].

Procedure

All [illegible] to meet [illegible] designated room [illegible] part of the [illegible] there, they were to [illegible] were several parts to the experiment (see Appe[illegible]). The first part, which would take place immediately, [illegible] several inventories which related to [illegible]. The subjects were also requested to [illegible] block of time on [illegible] of the following [illegible] portion of the experiment.

[illegible] (Form [illegible]) and Self-[illegible] Questionnaire [illegible] personal information [illegible] were given to [illegible]. To preserve confidentiality, subjects [illegible] to identify their [illegible] by some [illegible] time. These code numbers were used [illegible] experiment. At the end of the [illegible] the subjects were allowed to leave.

The [illegible] consisted of groups of [illegible] subjects [illegible] the same one-hour block of time. They were placed in a room and allowed to study (see [illegible]). One at a time they were taken from the room by the experimenter. Upon leaving the room, the subject was given a card with

[illegible] interview [illegible]. The [illegible] when he entered the room. There [illegible] between [illegible] the subject [illegible] confederate and stopped, the confederate noted on a card the distance between [illegible] designated by unobtrusive markings on the floor. [illegible] confederate read the question of which he had a copy [illegible] subject disclosed as much as he desired on that topic. [illegible] this disclosure the confederate continually [illegible] in the direction of the subject's face, thus enabling the confederate to [illegible] whenever there was eye-contact. The duration of this contact was then recorded by pressing on a button which registered the contact on an event-recorder. At the end of the interaction, the confederate again noted the interpersonal distance, recorded it on the data card, and dismissed the subject. Upon leaving the interview room, the subject was given a rating scale to rate his amount of self-disclosure to the confederate on the topic. Then the subject was returned to the waiting room by the experimenter.

Each subject went through this procedure once with half of them disclosing on the high intimacy question and

[illegible] one basic [illegible] tion of [illegible] value.

[illegible] five had finished the experimental portion [illegible], the purpose of the research was explained to them and questions answered. They were then presented with the second phase of the [illegible], that of naturalistic observations. [illegible], each subject was requested to estimate a [illegible] of inter-personal distance in a variety of [illegible] interactions. Also he was asked to rate each of these interactions in terms of age and sex of the [illegible], subject's relationship to the other [illegible] of interaction and the setting for the interaction. [illegible] of these interactions had restrictions [illegible] example, ten of them were to be with [illegible] (Appendix E). If a subject could not meet the [illegible], he was requested to turn in alternate [illegible] rather than fallacious data.

A few minutes were then [illegible] the subjects to estimate interpersonal distances [illegible] degree of accuracy. At the end of this [illegible], each subject estimated five predetermined distances and [illegible] them on a card. These were then used as estimates of the validity of their naturalistic observations. They were then given two weeks to complete the naturalistic phase of the experiment.

[illegible] analysis

[illegible] available [illegible] 16 [illegible] factor sco[illegible] of the [illegible]. There are four [illegible] from [illegible] available [illegible] information [illegible], sex, birth [illegible] from the [illegible] distance [illegible] for [illegible] which [illegible] relationship [illegible] of [illegible].

[illegible] (16PF [illegible] factor [illegible] regre[illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] of each factor in [illegible] the use of [illegible] personal distance.

[illegible]ts were [illegible] to high or low self-[illegible] groups based [illegible] *post hoc* identification. [illegible] distance [illegible] obtained under both naturalistic and experimental conditions were subjected to analysis of variance.

[illegible] the di[illegible] reactions to [illegible] experimental [illegible]ures

A [illegible] of analyses of [illegible] were made in an attempt to [illegible]er the extent [illegible] [illegible]l tionship between tre [illegible] of interpersonal [illegible] [illegible]ex, age, birth order, [illegible]ality, inte[illegible] [illegible] and interaction type.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The [illegible] consisted of [illegible] [illegible] following instruments:

1. [illegible] (1966);
2. [illegible] (1966);
3. [illegible] [illegible] Findings.
4. [illegible] Orientation.
5. [illegible] of [illegible] Interaction.
6. [illegible]port ratings of [illegible] [illegible] interaction.
7. [illegible] for each [illegible] [illegible] personal distance in an [illegible] setting.
8. [illegible] information [illegible] sex, birth order, number of siblings, [illegible] and religious preferences;
9. [illegible]port ratings of [illegible] interactions under [illegible] conditions with two distance estimates plus information regarding sex of other

[illegible] conditions.

[illegible] were [illegible] ity [illegible] and [illegible] of [illegible]. The 16PF [illegible] in a [illegible] design, [illegible] personal [illegible] the [illegible] variables. The [illegible] were [illegible] independently and in combination as independent variables, [illegible] distance from both high and [illegible] as the dependent variable. [illegible] would account for a [illegible] in interpersonal [illegible] formulated (series 1 - 6). As a result, [illegible] are presented.

[illegible] subjects [illegible] distance [illegible] scores. [illegible] High and [illegible] groups, [illegible] scores were used. Upper and [illegible] were determined and compared (Table 7). The results of an analysis of variance conducted over JSDQ group and intimacy level indicate that there is no difference in the use of distance in the high and low intimacy conditions. There seems to be a trend for the high JSDQ group to interact at a closer distance than the low JSDQ group, but the difference is non-significant. Also, there is no significant statistical interaction (Table 8).

[illegible]

[illegible] of variance [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]

Source	df	[illegible] squares	[illegible] square	F
Due to [illegible]	20	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Deviation [illegible] regression	35	[illegible]	[illegible]	
TOTAL	55	[illegible]		

[illegible] multiple correlation coefficient [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Source	df	[illegible]	Mean Squares	F
Due to regression	20	[illegible]	254.20	0.45
Deviation about regression	30	[illegible]	24.50	
TOTAL	50	[illegible]		

Multiple correlation coefficient 0.45

TABLE 8

[illegible] ON [illegible] INTI[illegible] ANCE
OF [illegible]

[illegible]	df	[illegible]	[illegible]	F
[illegible]	16	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible] about [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
TOTAL	[illegible]	[illegible]		

[illegible]

TABLE 9

[illegible]
[illegible] E
[illegible] SCORES

Source	[illegible]	Sum of [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Due to [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Deviation about regression	[illegible]	[illegible]	59.12	
TOTAL	[illegible]	[illegible]41.38		

Multiple [illegible] coefficient 0 38

Table 3

[illegible]

Source	df	[illegible]	[illegible]	F
[illegible]	4	1936.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	91	4579.[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	95	2 [illegible]35.87		

[illegible]

TABLE 8

[illegible] ANALYSIS OF [illegible]CE
[illegible] LINEAR REGRESSION
[illegible] SOCIAL DISTANCE
[illegible] SCORES

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Due to regression	4	1038.78	259.70	0.54
Deviation about regression	51	24502.59	480.44	
TOTAL		25541.37		

Multiple correlation coefficient 0.20

[illegible] Group

[illegible] scores 216-275

Mean JSDQ total scores 237.0

JSDQ Lower Quartile Group

Range of JSDQ total scores 78-161

Mean JSDQ total scores 123.4

		JSDQ GROUP	
		Upper	Lower
Intimacy level	High	45.1 inches n=14	54.3 inches n=14
	Low	47.9 inches n=14	50.8 inches n=14

TABLE [illegible]

[illegible] YCE
[illegible] SCORES
[illegible] LEVEL

Source	df	[illegible]	[illegible]	F	[illegible]
[illegible] Group	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	.61	[illegible]
[illegible] acy level	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	.74	NS
[illegible] ection	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	.31	NS
[illegible]ects within [illegible] groups	25	[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible] acy level by [illegible]ects within [illegible]ps	25	[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible]L	55	[illegible]			

[illegible] mental [illegible] of inte[illegible] distance in [illegible] setting [illegible] compari[illegible] with a stranger in a large or [illegible] The interactions were matched [illegible] experimental high intimacy topic situation [illegible] mean naturalistic interaction of [illegible] which includes ratings of [illegible] The experimental low intimacy [illegible] with the mean naturalistic [illegible] intimacy, which include [illegible] scales used by subjects.

The experimental and natu[illegible] were compared under the condition of [illegible] the condition of low intimacy. [illegible] was used for each intimacy condition, high intimacy $t = 1.00$, $df = 4$, low intimacy $t = .07$, $df = 23$). Results indicate that there was not a significant difference at the .05 level between the use of interpersonal distance in experimental and naturalistic conditions (Table 9). Thus hypothesis three was accepted.

It was predicted from hypothesis four that females would use closer distances for interpersonal interactions under all conditions. In the experimental setting the

[illegible]

[illegible] ION
[illegible] INT[illegible]-L

[illegible] Interaction

		Exp[illegible]	[illegible]alistic
[illegible]imacy level	High	40.0 [illegible] n=5	[illegible] inches n=5
	Low	45.7 [illegible] n=24	[illegible] inches n=24

[illegible] personal distance of [illegible] inches, [illegible] interacted at a mean distance of [illegible] inches. [illegible] intimacy condition females interacted [illegible] males interacted at 47.4 inches, [illegible] significantly different at the [illegible] level [illegible] (cells 10 and 11).

In the naturalistic setting [illegible] to the experimental setting were [illegible] distances used in those situations [illegible] individual. Thus in a large or small [illegible] room, while interacting with a stranger at a level of [illegible] intimacy (rating 4 or 5), males interacted at an [illegible] average distance of 49.3 inches, while females interacted [illegible] an average distance of 35.9 inches. This was significant at the .025 level using at t-test for unrelated means (t = 2.24, df = 26). When the same conditions are considered, while interacting at a relatively intimate level (1 or 2 on the scale), the mean distance for males is 42.7 inches, while being 69.00 inches for females. Although tested, it was not significant due to the small number of observations (t = 1.92, df = 3). When the same conditions for setting involved friends rather than strangers, males interacted at 31.4 inches under the high intimacy conditions, while females interacted at 22.7 inches which is significant at the .05 level (t = 1.95, df = 18). When the interaction

ABLE 10

[illegible] L A AL [illegible] TANCE
[illegible] ERSO [illegible] SCORES
[illegible] 1 [illegible]

[illegible]	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
[illegible]	[illegible]	3 57	3 57	00	NS
[illegible] level	[illegible]	12 89	12 89	19	NS
[illegible]ration	[illegible]	41.29	41.29	.09	NS
[illegible]jects within [illegible]x groups	54	[illegible]	845 17		
[illegible]timacy level by [illegible]ubjects within [illegible]roups	54	[illegible] 1 00	66 62		
[illegible]AL	111	1117.96			

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]ental s[illegible] [illegible] stranger

Intimacy level	Sex: Male	Sex: Female
High	[illegible]	48.4 inches n=28
Low	47.4 inches n=28	46.5 inches n=28

[illegible]alistic Set[illegible] with a Stranger

Intimacy level	Sex: Male	Sex: Female
High	42.7 inches n=3	69.0 inches n=2
Low	49.3 inches n=9	35.9 inches n=19

[illegible]tura[illegible]ic Setti[illegible] [illegible]th a Friend

Intimacy level	Sex: Male	Sex: Female
High	31.4 inches n=10	22.7 inches n=13
Low	43.6 inches n=10	36.8 inches n=13

[illegible] were used [illegible] because [illegible] variance of the samples [illegible] use of a [illegible] design. [illegible] against the hypothesis (Table 11). [illegible] were rejected, although trends were apparent.

[illegible] data from [illegible] have that in a [illegible] interactions with friends which are rated by the subjects as being of significant intimacy (1 or 2 on the [illegible] scale), would result in closer interpersonal distances than would interactions of minimal intimacy. These conditions were considered separately for males and females. In a large or small interpersonal room, males used a [illegible] distance of 31.[illegible] inches for the significant intimate [illegible] and increased their distance to 43.[illegible] inches for [illegible] intimacy interaction. Although this is a strong trend in the direction of the hypothesis, it is not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance (t = 1.60, df = 18). Factorial design was not used due to the size and variance of the samples.

Females followed the same pattern in that they interacted with friends in significant interactions at 22.7 inches, while using 36.8 inches for interactions of

[illegible] $t = [illegible]$, df = 21)

[illegible] inches [illegible] intimacy condition. This [illegible] the .05 level (t = 2.07, df = 17). [illegible] ons, females interact at 22.6 inches [illegible] respectively. This is significant at the [illegible] (t = [illegible], df = 27).

[illegible] setting, it was found that [illegible] for high intimacy and 34.0 [illegible] was significant at the [illegible] df = [illegible]). Among females, high intimacy [illegible] in distances of 17.3 inches [illegible] low intimacy [illegible] distances of 41.8 inches. [illegible] significant at the .025 level (t = 2.34, df = 25). [illegible] hypothesis five is accepted for females (Table 12).

It was [illegible] from hypothesis six that interactions with strangers of significant intimacy in both naturalistic and experimental conditions would result in greater interpersonal distance than would interactions of minimal intimacy. In the experimental setting, conditions were controlled such that all interactions were with strangers. The intimacy level was defined by the topic under consideration. Thus each individual interacted with a stranger under conditions of high and low

TABLE 12

[illegible] DISTANCE [illegible]
[illegible] OF [illegible]
[illegible] REALISTIC [illegible]

Intimacy Level and Sex		Setting: Large or small impersonal room	Small personal room	Outdoors
Male	[illegible]	31.4 inches n=10	24.8 inches n-13	[illegible] inches n-11
	[illegible]	43.6 inches n-10	37.2 inches n-6	[illegible] inches n-5
Female	[illegible]	22.7 inches n-10	22.6 inches n=18	17.5 inches n-14
	[illegible]	6.8 inches n-13	48.2 inches n=11	41.8 inches n=13

[illegible] high [illegible] intimacy [illegible] signif[illegible]

In the [illegible] were used [illegible] large or small impersonal [illegible] as high intimacy for [illegible] 1 and 2 [illegible] for rating 4 or 5. [illegible] subjects [illegible] interactions on [illegible] that the data could be [illegible] using a [illegible] samples. The mean distance for a high intimacy [illegible] with strangers was 52.1 inches while [illegible] for a low intimacy interaction was 53.8 inches. The difference is significant at the .05 level (t = 2.24, df = 4). Thus hypothesis six is rejected in the experimental setting and accepted in the naturalistic setting (Table 13).

In summary, the statistical analyses indicated.

1. Hypothesis one was rejected. Interpersonal distance is not linearly related to personality variables.

2. Hypothesis two was rejected. Subjects with high JSDQ scores did not interact at a significantly closer distance than subjects with low JSDQ scores.

[illegible]

		Sitting	
		[illegible]	Natural sitting
Intimacy level	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] inches n=5
	[illegible]	[illegible]	33.8 inches n=5

[illegible] Interpersonal [illegible] ing was [illegible] used in [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] did [illegible] under all [illegible] than did males.

Hypothesis [illegible] was accepted for females: [illegible] significantly closer distances [illegible] topics with friends than [illegible] topics under all setting [illegible] used significantly [illegible] in all but the impersonal [illegible].

[illegible] was accepted in the [illegible] setting. Interactions of high [illegible] with a stranger resulted in [illegible] personal distance than for [illegible] of low intimacy.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

[illegible] feature of each individual's [illegible] hypothesis of research was the [illegible] relationship between certain personality variables and the use of interpersonal distance [illegible] to be true using a multiple [illegible] design. The non-significant finding leads one to [illegible] possible explanations. One is that personality variables are, in fact, not related to the use of interpersonal distance. This seems to be a premature judgment at this stage of research in this area. The second explanation is that personality variables are related to inter-personal distance in a non-linear [illegible]. This alternative can be tested if it is possible to locate or construct a program for analyzing and testing a multiple curvilinear regression. An attempt will be made to pursue this alternative. The third explanation is that there are other personality variables which have not been

[illegible]

has been done in the [illegible]

In considering [illegible] there were several 16 [illegible] consistently higher partial correlations [illegible] distance. Although not significant, [illegible] indicates a possible statistical [illegible] further strengthened and clarified [illegible] (emotional vs. outgoing), h (shy [illegible] group-dependent vs. self-sufficient [illegible] vs. controlled). The first [illegible] considered in the first hypothesis as being [illegible] of interpersonal distance.

The JSDQ was also [illegible] questionnaire specifically oriented [illegible] self-disclosure. Since its relationship to the 16PF was unknown, the first-order factors of the two tests were factor analyzed together. The second-order factors obtained from the combined 16PF and JSDQ analysis indicate the JSDQ measures a variable which is not primarily measured by the 16PF. There seems to be some differentiation within the JSDQ itself as to its relationship with the 16PF. Whereas the subscores on the JSDQ for mother, father and female friend constitute a factor relatively

[illegible] male or female [illegible] this particular topic would be [illegible]eritable.

Self-disclosure as measured by the JSDQ was used to delineate two groups of subjects. One consisted of individuals who scored very high on the JSDQ, while the other was of individuals who had scored very low. It was hypothesized that the high JSDQ group would interact at a closer distance. Their use of interpersonal distance was compared using a t-test for unrelated samples. The differences between the groups was non-significant at the .05 level, but with a strong trend in the direction of the hypothesis. Thus we find that individuals who score high on the JSDQ tend to interact at closer distances with strangers under both intimate (45.1 inches vs. 54.3 inches) and non-intimate conditions (47.9 inches vs. 50.6 inches). Since there were unequal numbers of males and females in each group, the groups were divided by sex in an attempt to find out if the difference was due to sex differences. Hypothesis four would lead to predictions that the difference between the groups in interpersonal distance may be caused by sex differences between groups rather than the other factors under consideration.

[illegible] upper [illegible] lower [illegible] and [illegible] noticeable among females.

Further analysis of [illegible] produced more results indicating [illegible] of factors. These subjects [illegible] changes in distance when [illegible] the high JSDQ group was r = [illegible] between distances for the low JSDQ group was r = [illegible] This we see a strong, consistent trend for individuals of the high JSDQ group to move farther away under conditions of low intimacy. The opposite occurs in the low JSDQ group where there is an extremely consistent tendency to move significantly closer under conditions of low intimacy. This was not an anticipated finding. The two groups, one from either end of the JSDQ score continuum, did seem to react differently to changes in topic intimacy. This may indicate a more pervasive difference between the two groups than just JSDQ scores. Justice (1969) found that field dependent individuals tended to use closer distances than

[illegible] aligned [illegible] and the [illegible] of [illegible] is in the physical dimension. Members of the high JSDQ group may be less dependent on others, resulting in a greater freedom to have minimal interactions without attempting to increase intimacy by moving closer.

Several other measures of the interactions were taken for a number of the subjects. These measures include length of interaction, amount and frequency of eye-contact and amount of disclosure. Comparing the high JSDQ group with the low JSDQ group, we find that the mean length of interaction, which is slightly over one minute, is nearly identical for both groups in the high intimacy condition. As the intimacy decreases, the interaction length increases. The mean increase in the high JSDQ group is 20%, while the low JSDQ group increased the length of interaction by 54%. The quantity of eye-contact was also measured. The high JSDQ group maintained eye-contact 19% of the time in the high intimacy condition, while the low JSDQ group maintained eye contact 15% of the time. When the intimacy of the topic decreased, the high group increased eye contact to an average 26% of the interaction time, while eye-contact remained at 15% for the low group. Comparing the self-reported amount of disclosure by subjects on the topics using a three-point rating scale,

[illegible] ing of [illegible] group [illegible] intimacy [illegible] increased to [illegible] group's [illegible] to 2.00.

[illegible] several interrelated [illegible] the verbal interactions. For the high JSDQ group, we find that when the topic becomes less intimate, the distance tends to increase, the length of interaction increases, eye-contact increases and the amount of disclosure increases. For the low JSDQ group, when the topic decreases in intimacy, the interpersonal distance decreases, length of interaction increases, eye-contact remains the same and amount of disclosure increases. This seems to indicate that there are several variables which interact to maintain a given level of interpersonal contact. This agrees in part with Argyle [illegible] (1965) theory that eye-contact and interpersonal distance may both serve as controls for intimacy level. However, the data indicates that there may be more than just these two variables which have a regulatory part in communication. Length of verbal interaction seems closely related as does amount of information disclosed. It seems likely that there may be even more variables which should be considered. These include the reason for the interaction, characteristics of the verbal

[illegible] and [illegible] dedne [illegible] some differences [illegible] low JSDQ groups.

At this [illegible] since the high and [illegible] ordered, [illegible] order of interc[illegible] not enter in a[illegible] had the high in[illegible] had the high int[illegible] second w[illegible] t-test for [illegible] sample. The test [illegible] ant at the .05 level or even at the [illegible] (t = [illegible], df = 54). The same was true of the low [illegible] ions (t = .73, df = .54).

Hypothesis three was co[illegible] the differing responses under experimental [illegible] conditions. This resulted in the problem of [illegible] about measuring interpersonal distances outside of the laboratory without being obtrusive and invalidating the results. Also, if results could actually be collected from naturalistic conditions, an analysis could be made of how individuals modify their behavior for psychology experiments, or at

[illegible] nal [illegible] ptions by [illegible] ro were [illegible] first rea[illegible] ecome [illegible] In the last [illegible] as no way [illegible] their reported [illegible] tions [illegible], an alternate [illegible] vised. [illegible] their estim[illegible] ces in [illegible] ental setting [illegible] core [illegible] the devi[illegible] estimates and [illegible] erpersonal [illegible] perimental [illegible] average [illegible] incon- [illegible] have t[illegible] naturalistic [illegible] When all [illegible] verage [illegible] ance estimate[illegible] eight inches [illegible], the total mean deviation was 3.7 inches [illegible] ies had an average deviation of 3.8 [illegible] were 3.6 inches. These means were not signifi[illegible] ent at the .05 level of significance.

O[illegible] of the data regarding the subjects' abilit[illegible] erpersonal distance, the naturalistic data may [illegible] ed to be relati[illegible] reliable. This conclusion is congruent with the results of a *t*-test for related samples which indicates that there is not a significant difference between the two sets of observations, naturalistic and experimental under either high or low intimacy conditions.

[illegible] In the experiment [illegible] it [illegible] females did not interact at significantly [illegible] than did males [illegible] collied to both high [illegible] ons (49.[illegible] inches vs. 40.1 inches) and low [illegible] (46.5 inches vs. 37.1 inches). In the naturalistic setting, there did [illegible] differences [illegible] high intimacy conditions, interacting with a stranger, males were closer [illegible] than females (60.[illegible] inches). The opposite [illegible] low intimacy conditions where females [illegible] strangers at 35.9 inches, which is significantly closer than males (41.3 inches). When one [illegible] naturalistic settings with friends, again females [illegible] at a significantly closer distance in the high intimacy condition (22.7 inches vs. 31.4 inches) and a trend toward being closer in the low intimacy condition (36.8 inches vs. 43.0 inches). Thus there seems to be contradictory evidence regarding sex differences. In the naturalistic settings females were closer than males in all but one condition and this one was not significantly different. If the one comparison is dropped due to the small number of observations involved, it would leave the results as females interacting closer than males in the naturalistic conditions and at the same distances in the experimental conditions. This is similar to findings by Willis (1966) who found

[illegible] ing a [illegible] accepted [illegible] are open and [illegible] possibility [illegible] that females, [illegible] than males, tend to have [illegible] difference for interpersonal [illegible] subjective distances to [illegible] of a male, [illegible] distances. This could be [illegible] by comparing [illegible] distance by tall and [illegible] males and [illegible] analysis of variance design.

hypothesis fi[illegible] topic intimacy upon the use of [illegible] with friends. Here we find that [illegible] females interact at closer distances [illegible] topics than for low intimacy topics. [illegible] possible that in a situation where an individual feels relatively free to voluntarily reveal himself to another person, that individual also decreases the physical distance separating him from the other person. One may continue to theorize that the revealing of oneself could be a potentially threatening experience. Therefore if one were to reveal intimate things about oneself to a stranger, because of the risk involved, one may use distance as a barrier, increasing the distance as intimacy increases. The results of hypothesis six illustrate this idea. In the

[illegible]
[illegible] intimacy [illegible].

[illegible] interpersonal [illegible] people emotional and [illegible] distance [illegible] relationship if all [illegible] are [illegible]. This may relate to the [illegible] (1971) [illegible] observed the incons[illegible]. One could conclude [illegible] they may [illegible] distance. From this reasoning, [illegible] hypothesize that the inconsistent use [illegible] relate to an inconsistent emotional [illegible] could make use of d[illegible] by considering it as an indic[illegible] distance. It could serve as a gauge of [illegible] reactions, thus it could be used as a too[illegible] the other person.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

[illegible] than would [illegible] 6 [illegible] would [illegible] strangers.

[illegible] college students, [illegible] and 28 females [illegible] for the experiment. They each completed forms [illegible], the JSDQ and an Inventory of

[illegible] until [illegible] waiting room [illegible] a card co[illegible] ions pertaining to an experimental interaction in which they would take part. They were to write down [illegible] as much as they desired about a given [illegible] topic in the [illegible] there. The confederate was a same sex [illegible] to measure the personal distance. The [illegible] on was given on the card so that [illegible] was going to talk about [illegible] room. This topic was either a [illegible] or a high intimacy [illegible] topics.

After the [illegible] the confederate was not to m[illegible] the subject, the subject left the experimental [illegible] a [illegible]-point rating scale to report his [illegible] of pleasure to the confederate. He then returned to the waiting room and the next subject was taken. Each subject went through the process twice, once each with high and low intimacy questions. Then the subjects were informed of the purpose of the experiment and questions were answered. The third or naturalistic phase of the experiment was explained: Each person was to observe his own interactions in his daily life. He was to

[illegible] interaction [illegible]. In [illegible] of this [illegible] females were [illegible] post-[illegible].

[illegible] available [illegible] including the [illegible] of estimating inter-[illegible] distances, all subjects [illegible] in a short training [illegible] where they practiced estimating distances and [illegible] measured [illegible]. Finally, the subjects [illegible] passed at [illegible] distances and asked [illegible] their estimate of the distance. This [illegible] information for each [illegible] was computed and the information was later used to [illegible] naturalistic observations of certain subjects or [illegible] of their demonstrated ineptness at estimating [illegible].

[illegible] factors from the 16PF and JSDQ were factor [illegible] to determine their interrelationships with each other. The first order factors were also used in a multiple [illegible] regression equation with interpersonal distance as the dependent variable. Subjects were assigned [illegible] low JSDQ groups based on post-hoc identification on the use of interpersonal distance by the two groups [illegible] and analyzed. Interpersonal distances in the naturalistic and experimental settings were compared. [illegible] tests were also conducted on secondary variables such as sex, age, relationship,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible] personal distance in an experimental setting.

2. [illegible] provides a personality factor which [illegible] captured by the 16PF.

3. [illegible] with high JSDQ scores do not [illegible] experimental setting at a significantly [illegible] interpersonal distance than do individuals with low JSDQ scores, although trends are [illegible].

4. [illegible] interpersonal distance similarly to experimental and naturalistic settings.

5. [illegible] interact at significantly closer distances than do males in an experimental setting with a stranger. Females do interact at significantly closer distances in a naturalistic setting with a stranger regarding a personal topic.

6. Females [illegible] significantly closer distances for interactions of some intimacy with friends than

[illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] independent [illegible] [illegible] a [illegible] model [illegible] [illegible] differences

1. [illegible] greater [illegible] of [illegible] intimacy with [illegible] minimal [illegible] experimental [illegible] the [illegible] apparent.

2. [illegible] which [illegible] of [illegible] situations [illegible] those [illegible] and [illegible] topic, [illegible] of the [illegible], [illegible] and the amount of [illegible].

There is considerable [illegible] in the area of [illegible]. [illegible] needed in [illegible] to [illegible] given [illegible] individual [illegible] may be [illegible]. It seems that multivariate statistics are going to be necessary for any thorough analysis because of the [illegible] among variables.

[illegible] research [illegible] of [illegible] communication avenue, [illegible] distance. Thus it [illegible] possible [illegible] people, distance [illegible], [illegible] quality, people and [illegible]. If this were so, [illegible] could then study the characteristics of those [illegible] different [illegible].

[illegible] of distance is [illegible] present and [illegible] study, the [illegible] distance considered, [illegible] would be [illegible] it. It may [illegible] this study took too broad a sample to get meaningful [illegible]. Here, people in general were observed and their use of distance analyzed. Perhaps if one were to select two samples of individuals who used distance differently and then attempted to discover how they differed in other dimensions, it would be more possible to delineate specific factors. One could make hypotheses about a variety of personality variables which may be relevent.

It is also possible that the personality questionnaire used did not sample dimensions relevant to the use of interpersonal distance. They may have been too tenuously related to the phenomenon, so that translation to concrete behavior was beyond their range of function. Or it

[illegible] the [illegible] its [illegible] in a [illegible] from [illegible], the [illegible] of the [illegible] ances may not have been consistent.

Since there seems to be [illegible] right directions for those hypotheses [illegible] have significant results, one may [illegible] hypotheses are worth considering with modifications in procedure. A narrowing of the scope of the [illegible] increase the sample size for a particular [illegible] thus increasing the power of the statistics used.

More work is needed in the area of naturalistic research. In general the results found in this particular study indicate that interactions between two human beings may be studied in a laboratory setting with some confidence that the results resemble interactions in non-laboratory settings, but there may be some differences. Individuals seems to feel pressure to do well, to please the experimenter, to second-guess the measured variables and so on. As a result, refinement of the technique, which involves the subjects of an experiment in becoming observers and experimenters of their own behavior, seems to be one means of discovering what people are like out in the non-laboratory world.

[illegible] physical [illegible] dimensions. [illegible] and [illegible] someone [illegible] be a dimension [illegible] part of [illegible] being. [illegible] research indicates [illegible] stance decreases as the relationship between individuals becomes more intimate, voluntarily [illegible] another person, which is the [illegible] decrease in personal distance, may have implications of intimacy or personal closeness beyond the various physical closeness [illegible] in the area of interpersonal distance may range from the nearness of touch to the farthest limits of communication. Our knowledge in this area is yet in an introductory state and each answer which is found gives rise to a multitude of new questions.

ANNEXE 1

[illegible] IRE

[illegible]

[illegible]ion

[illegible]ople differ in [illegible] in they let other [illegible]ople know them. We are [illegible]ng to investigate what [illegible]eople tell others about themselves.

Naturally, the things that are true about your personality, your feelings, your problems, hopes and actions will change as you get on with living. Therefore, the idea that other people have about you will be out of date from time-to-time. What was true about you last week or last year may no longer be true. When you see people after a lapse of time, and you want them to know you as you now are, you tell them about yourself so that they will have a more up-to-date picture of you. If you don't want them to know, you don't tell them, even if they ask you personal questions.

Some of the things about yourself you will regard as more personal and private than others, people differ widely in what they consider appropriate to let others know, and what they consider is nobody's business but their own.

Instructions

On the next page there is a list of topics that pertain to you. You have also been given a special answer-sheet. What we want you to do is indicate on the answer-sheet the degree to which you have let each of several people in your life know this information about you.

You have a reasonably good idea of how much about yourself you have let each of the people know about you in the past, and how current and up-to-date their knowledge about you is at the present.

Therefore, will you indicate on the answer-sheet the extent to which each of the other persons now knows the pertinent facts about you. In other words, how complete, up-to-date, and accurate is their picture of you as you are now. Use the following scale to indicate your answers:

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] person [illegible] now, [illegible] true in th[illegible] idea of me [illegible] complete or up[illegible]

[illegible] person full[illegible] me as [illegible] in this [illegible], because I have [illegible]ed about [illegible] topic to [illegible], in the recen[illegible], and t[illegible] have not [illegible]. I have kept [illegible] fully infor[illegible] about this [illegible] of me

[illegible] an X instead of an 0 for those item[illegible] which [illegible]ld not confide to the person even if that [illegible] asked you to reveal the information.

[illegible] you dislike about your overall appearance.
[illegible] things about your appearance that you like [illegible], or are proudest of
[illegible] chief health concern, worry, or problem, [illegible] present time.
[illegible] favorite spare-time hobbies or interests.
[illegible] and dislikes at present.

[illegible] religious activity at present--whether or [illegible] go to church, which one, how often.
[illegible] religious views.
[illegible] write reading materials--kinds of [illegible], books, or papers you usually read
[illegible] annoys you most about your [illegible] of the opposite sex or (if [illegible] spouse.
[illegible] you have sex problems, and the [illegible] problems, if any.

[illegible] knowledge of your sex life up to the [illegible], the names of your sex partners in [illegible] present, if any, your ways of getting [illegible] satisfaction.
[illegible] personality that worry you [illegible].
[illegible] and certain[illegible] in your daily work.
[illegible] things about [illegible] that you worry about at [illegible]sent.
[illegible]at you are most sensitive about.

[illegible] What you feel the guiltiest about, or most ashamed of in your past.

[illegible]

[illegible] thing [illegible]
[illegible] nce, e.g., [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] others [illegible]
[illegible] us.
[illegible] of your father that you do not
[illegible]
[illegible] of your mother that you do not like
[illegible]
[illegible] dream - what you day-dream
[illegible]
[illegible] most trouble controlling,
[illegible] ger, jealousy, etc.

[illegible] that you have had in
[illegible]
[illegible] of life-work.
[illegible] ardicaos to doing a
[illegible] lic.
[illegible] of races and degrees
[illegible] ut other religious
[illegible]

[illegible] resent time.
[illegible] ome major decision
in [illegible] job, break engage-
ment, [illegible] something big-
You [illegible] d or jokes you like to
hear
[illegible] wings, if so, the amount
[illegible] oudest of and take
[illegible] your car or musical
instrument [illegible], etc.

[illegible] you [illegible], e.g., well or poorly or
[illegible] elp [illegible]
[illegible] television programs.
[illegible] ics.
[illegible] groups or clubs or organizations you belong
[illegible], e.g., in Masonry, lodge, bridge-club, YMCA,
[illegible] organizations, etc.
[illegible] you do not like to drink, e.g.,
[illegible], coke, beer, liquor, etc., and your
[illegible] average.

	OTHER	FATHER	MA[illegible] FATHER	FEMALE FRIEND	SPOUSE		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	SPOUSE
1						21					
2						22					
3						23					
4						24					
5						25					
6						26					
7						27					
8						28					
9						29					
10						30					
11						31					
12						32					
13						33					
14						34					
15						35					
16						36					
17						37					
18						38					
19						39					
20						40					

APPENDIX B

[illegible]AL I[illegible]ORMATIO[illegible]

Age _____

Sex M F

Birthdate _____

No. of brothers and sisters: _____

Birth order: Only Oldest Second Third Fourth Other

Ancestral ethnicity(s) _____

Parent's religious preference (if any): _____

Your religious preference (if any): _____

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] your [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]ests. [illegible] enough so that [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] you [illegible] to do.

[illegible]ion H

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[illegible]

[illegible] _____ [illegible]

[illegible] 1 2 3 4

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1 2 3 A S

[illegible] 1 2 3 4 5

[illegible] 1 A I F

_____ _____ _____

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] ll,
[illegible]
[illegible] ould [illegible] d
arms
[illegible] ould not touch

[illegible]

[illegible] looks
[illegible] ant depth
[illegible] Some depth
[illegible] ome depth
[illegible] contact

Age

Y- younger
S- same age
O- older
P- authority, parent
A- authority, other

[illegible]ationship

[illegible] ery close friend
P- friend
[illegible]- acquaintance/friend
A- acquaintance
S- stranger

[illegible]tting

O- outside
[illegible]- large room
I- impersonal small room
P- personal small room

[illegible]

[illegible] DULE

Relationship	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stranger	1 or 2	[illegible]
Stranger	4 or 5	[illegible]
Acquaintance	1 or 2	[illegible]
Acquaintance	4 or 5	[illegible]
Friend	1 or 2	[illegible]
Friend	4 or 5	[illegible]
Very close friend	1 or 2	[illegible]
Very close friend	4 or 5	[illegible]
	TOTAL	[illegible]

APPENDIX F

[illegible] INSTRUCTIONS

[illegible] name i. Gary [illegible] parts, the first [illegible] evening. This will [illegible] take three inventories [illegible] with you as a person. Two of [illegible] third is quite different. Instead of [illegible] of the experimental materials, [illegible] a code number. That way I can [illegible] information together without your name being used. [illegible] which we will use will be the last four [illegible] your telephone number. If you do not have a [illegible] know it will be the same as someone else who is [illegible], please let me know so we can get a number for you.

As is obvious, it is possible to "psych out" the questionnaires that you will take. Please don't, since that will make the data irrelevant and the experiment a waste of time.

The next part of this experiment will be a session lasting one hour or less, at this room, later this week. I am going to bring around sheets for you to sign up for a time. When you come next time, bring homework or reading since you will have some time to fill.

At the end of the next session I will describe the experiment to you, answer any questions you may have about it, and tell you about the remainder of the study.

[illegible] study [illegible], but [illegible] talk about [illegible] taking each of [illegible] these have been complete[illegible] the [illegible] and I will try to answer [illegible] also, at that time, I will describe the remainder of the [illegible] to you.

[illegible]

[illegible] with [illegible] will not be a usual [illegible] of an interaction. [illegible] proceed as follows: You will go into [illegible] where the other person will be standing [illegible]. The other person will read the question [illegible] and you will tell him or her as much [illegible] that topic. That person will not give a [illegible] remain silent throughout. Then you [illegible] they instruct you to:

QUESTION

Tell me about your favorite hobbies and interests. Elaborate enough so that I get some feeling about what kinds of things you like to do.

[illegible]

[illegible] interaction with [illegible] it will not be a [illegible] proceed as [illegible] ore the [illegible] The other person will [illegible] (see below) and you will tell [illegible] about that topic. That person [illegible], but will remain [illegible] when they instruct you to.

[illegible]

Tell [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] are able.

[illegible] behavior. [illegible], 1967.

[illegible], M. and [illegible] tact, [illegible]ce and [illegible]filiation, [illegible], 1965, [illegible] 504.

[illegible], J. B. [illegible] pathology. [illegible] Amer., [illegible], [illegible] 148.

[illegible], R. B. and [illegible] Sixteen [illegible] Chicago, Ill. [illegible] and Ability [illegible], 1962.

[illegible], [illegible] handbook [illegible] Manual, [illegible] ity and [illegible], 1967.

[illegible] factor [illegible] and Cattell [illegible] Differ. Soc. Psychol., [illegible] 1, [illegible].

[illegible] value for selecting [illegible] Rel., 1954, [illegible].

[illegible] biographical [illegible] Psychol. Mono., [illegible].

[illegible]ristian, [illegible], [illegible] and Davis, D. E. Factors in mass mo[illegible] Sitka deer. Chesapeake Sci., 1960, 1, 79-[illegible].

Dosey, M. A. and [illegible] sonal space and self-protection. J. [illegible] Psychol., 1969, 11, 93-97.

[illegible], [illegible] Experi[illegible] Interaction: A situational determinant of differential levels of self-disclosure. [illegible]niversity of Florida, 1968.

[illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] -98.

[illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] Psychol , 1[illegible], 81-33.

[illegible] and [illegible] 1, 1969.

[illegible] [illegible] eractiors [illegible] 1 , [illegible] .

[illegible] S , [illegible] of [illegible] space

[illegible] self-[illegible]

[illegible] , 1[illegible], [illegible]

[illegible] on of [illegible] , [illegible] orm. Soc [illegible]

[illegible] ata. J. [illegible]

[illegible] enerate of [illegible] ates [illegible]

[illegible] chol , 1965,

[illegible] , [illegible] Value [illegible] versity of Denver, [illegible]

Luft, [illegible] n non [illegible] chol , 1966, 63, [illegible]-268.

Mayo, [illegible] Self-[illegible] J. Soc. Clin. Psychol , [illegible] 7, [illegible]-148

[illegible] read [illegible]

[illegible] relates [illegible], 1966, [illegible], 7-88

[illegible] The a[illegible] [illegible], 192(3), [illegible]

[illegible] Silent Language [illegible] [illegible]day, 1959.

[illegible] The language of space [illegible], 10, [illegible]1-45.

[illegible] Proxemics, a study of [illegible] relations. [illegible] Galston (Ed.), Man's [illegible] and [illegible]rology, [illegible] York [illegible] 1963a.

[illegible] system for notation o[illegible] [illegible]ehavior, [illegible], 1963b, 65, 10[illegible]

[illegible] The Hidden Dimension [illegible] York [illegible]day, 1966.

[illegible] Handbook of Small Group [illegible] York [illegible] Press, 1962, 139-

[illegible]in, P. and Lubin, B. [illegible] of the self-disclosure inventory [illegible] [illegible]ion technique. J. Psychol., 1965, [illegible]

[illegible], [illegible]. Human spatial behavior. [illegible] J. [illegible] Other, 1965, 19, 20-28.

[illegible], [illegible]. Duff, D. F. and Stratton, L. O. Body-buffer [illegible] Arch. Gen. Psychiat., 1964, 11, 651-656.

[illegible]rley, J. R. and Hurley, S. J. Toward authenticity in measuring self-disclosure, 1968.

[illegible]rard, S. M. The Transparent Self. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

[illegible] Self-disclosure and self-acceptance. [illegible] University of Florida, 1967.

[illegible] on [illegible] 1[illegible]-[illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible]

Sommer, [illegible], 1959, 22, [illegible]

[illegible] 1961, [illegible]

[illegible] A further [illegible] 1[illegible]-116.

Vargas, R [illegible] of certain personality characteristics of male [illegible] positive experiences [illegible] Eastern Psychological Association [illegible], 1969

Willis, R [illegible] function of [illegible], 1966, [illegible]

[illegible] SKETCH

[illegible] in L[illegible], [illegible] September [illegible] [illegible] from [illegible] High School in June, [illegible]. [illegible] Assistant Dean of Men at [illegible] in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, he [illegible] State Junior College. In August, [illegible] *cum laude* from Moorhead State College, [illegible]sota, [illegible]lor in psychology. He entered the Graduate School [illegible] University of Florida in September, 1967, as [illegible] Title IV Fellow. He received his Master of Arts in [illegible]chology in August, 1970. He is presently completing a joint clinical/counseling psychology internship at the University of Florida.

I [illegible] in my o[illegible] ly pre[illegible], as a [illegible].

Harry [illegible]
Dr [illegible]
Professor of [illegible]

I [illegible] this study and [illegible] opinio[illegible] acceptable standards of scholarly present[illegible] adequate, in scope and quality, as a di[illegible] degree of Doctor of [illegible].

David Suchman
Dr. David [illegible], Ch[illegible]
Assistant Professor of P[illegible]

I c[illegible] I have read this study and that in my opinion [illegible] to acceptable standards of scholarly present[illegible] fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a diss[illegible] for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sidney [illegible] Jourard
Dr Sidney Jourard
Professor of Psychology

I c[illegible] I have read this study and that in my opinion [illegible] to acceptable standards of scholarly presenta[illegible] fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a di[illegible] for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Madelaine [illegible] Ramey
Dr Madelaine Corey Farey
Assistant Professor of Psych[illegible]

I ce[illegible] read this study and that in my opinion [illegible] acceptable standards of scholarly present[illegible] fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dis[illegible] Doctor of Philosophy

Franz [illegible]
Dr Franz [illegible]
Assis[illegible] of Psych[illegible]

[illegible]

Dr. Norman Markel
Associate Professor of [illegible]

[illegible] cal the study and the [illegible] opinion, [illegible] form [illegible] able standards of [illegible] presentation and is [illegible] quate, in scope and [illegible] as a [illegible] ation for [illegible] Doctor of Philo[illegible]

Dr. Donald Avila
Associate Professor of Educat[illegible]

This dissertation was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate Council, and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June, 1971

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dean, Graduate School